

REMARKS

Claims 12, 19, 39, 41-44 are amended. Claims 17, 23, 40 are canceled. Claims 66-68 are canceled. Claims 1-65 remain in the application. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the application be forwarded on to issuance.

Teleconference with Examiner

Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for the time that the Examiner spent recently on the telephone discussing this application. Applicant maintains its position with respect to the art as articulated in the previous response. Responsive to Applicant's telephone conference with the Examiner, Applicant undertook a very thorough study of the cited references and, for the reasons set forth below, maintains that the claims are patentably distinct from the references.

§102 and §103 Rejections

Claims 1-3, 8-10, 12, 15-19, 21-26, 28-31, 39, 44-47, 49, and 51-65 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,248,946 to Dwek (hereinafter "Dwek").

Claims 4, 17, 23, 25, 26, 32, 33, 35-38, 40, 42, 50 and 66-68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dwek in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,223,224 to Bodin et al. (hereinafter "Bodin").

Claims 7, 11, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dwek in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,330,670 to England et al. (hereinafter "England").

1 Claims 14, 20, and 48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dwek in
2 view of U.S. Patent No. 6,248,946 to Van Zoest et al. (hereinafter "Van Zoest").

3 Claim 41 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dwek in view of
4 Bodin and further in view of England.

5
6 **Claims Rejected over Dwek under § 102**

7 **Claim 1** recites a method of providing a user experience when playing
8 media on a media player comprising [emphasis added]:

- 9
- 10 • downloading a file that contains at least one media-specific file
11 configured to provide a user interface, and media content with
12 which the user interface is associated;
 - 13 • playing the media content with a media player; and
 - 14 • automatically displaying the user interface when the media content is
15 played with the media player.

16 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Dwek
17 anticipates the subject matter of this claim. Specifically, the Office argues that
18 column 15, lines 5-8 and 14-18, and column 11 line 66 through column 12 line 4
19 discloses downloading a file that contains at least one media-specific *file*
20 configured to provide a *user interface*, and media content with which the user
21 interface is associated.

22 Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the Office's rejection. First,
23 Applicant would like to point out an explicit teaching in Dwek which is
24 unambiguously and explicitly dispositive of the issue of whether Dwek anticipates
25 this claim. Specifically, the Office's attention is directed to column 4, lines 53-59.

1 There, Dwek describes aspects of its song file servers. The excerpt is provided
2 just below:

3
4 The song file servers 116 contain all of the song files available
5 through the online music delivery system 100. Preferably, *each music*
6 *selection is stored in an individual song file* in a basic, uncompressed raw
7 format. In that case, all translation, compression, and other formatting is
8 performed by the translation/streaming servers 118....(emphasis added).

9
10 Further on in column 4, Dwek instructs as follows:

11
12 The translation/streaming servers 118 provide the interface points
13 for one or more users to access the music selections...through the user's
14 music player....The translation/streaming servers receive song files in a raw
15 uncompressed format from the song file servers 116, then compress the
16 song files, and stream the compressed song files across the Internet
17 connection...to the user's music player.... (Column 4, lines 60-67).

18
19 This description is consistent throughout the extent of Dwek's disclosure.
20 That is, Dwek contemplates individual separate and complete song files which,
21 incidently, teaches directly away from the subject matter of this claim. Anything
22 else that might happen to be rendered in conjunction with a song does not come
23 from the song file that is streamed across the Internet.

24
25 Why is this important and germane? Because this claim specifically recites
26 a file that contains at least one media-specific file configured to provide a user
27 interface, and media content with which the user interface is associated.

28
29 In the excerpts cited by the Office, no mention whatsoever is made of a file
30 that contains at least one media-specific file configured to provide a user
31 interface, as defined above, and media content with which the user interface is

1 associated. The excerpts cited by the Office are reproduced below for the Office's
2 convenience, along with a short discussion after each:

3
4 **Column 11 Line 66-Column 12 line 4:** The features pane
5 preferably includes a "skins" button to allow a user to create, or
6 select a precreated, "skin" or custom appearance template for the
7 user interface of the music player. By changing skins, a user can
8 customize the size, shape, color, or other appearance features of the
9 panes, handles, and buttons of the user interface.

10 This excerpt merely discusses the notion of a pane that allows a user to
11 create or select a skin. Applicant can find no disclosure in this excerpt that
12 describes or even remotely suggests a file that contains at least one media-specific
13 file configured to provide a user interface, and media content with which the user
14 interface is associated.

15 **Column 15, Lines 5-8:** In a preferred embodiment, the
16 advertisements may include tie-ins to particular music selections
17 being played by the music player.

18 This excerpt simply describes the notion of advertisements that may include
19 tie ins to a particular music selection. Dwek, earlier in column 14, instructs that
20 "the advertisements are delivered across the Internet from the online music library
21 110 to the music player 120." Nowhere does Dwek disclose or suggest that these
22 advertisements comprise part of the file that contains the media content. Rather,
23 from the context of Dwek and its earlier description of the individual song files, it
24 would appear that the advertisements do not comprise part of the song file. If
25 Dwek built a file that contained **both** a media-specific file configured to provide a
user interface and media content with which the user interface is associated, don't
you think Dewk would have specifically called this out in the specification? The

1 answer to this question is self-evident. Dwek did not specifically call this out
2 because Dwek does not contemplate a file that contains both a media-specific file
3 configured to provide a user interface and media content with which the user
4 interface is associated.

5
6 **Column 15, Lines 14-18:** The *information pane* includes
7 information about a music selection currently being delivered to the
8 user's computer via the online music delivery system. *The*
9 *information may include a song title, an artist name, a CD or*
10 *album title, etc.*

11 Here, Dwek describes the use of an information pane that includes
12 information about a music selection currently being delivered to the user's
13 computer, where the information may include a song title, an artist name, or a CD
14 or album title. Again, this excerpt in no way, shape or form teaches *a file* that
15 contains at least one media-specific file configured to provide a *user interface,*
16 *and media content* with which the user interface is associated.

17 The excerpts cited by the Office neither disclose nor suggest the subject
18 matter of this claim. Accordingly, for at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

19 **Claims 2-7** depend from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an
20 allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
21 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither disclosed
22 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
23 another. In addition, given the allowability of claim 1, the rejection of claim 4
24 over the combination with Bodin, and claim 5 and 6 over the combination with
25 Bodin and Van Zoest, and the rejection of claim 7 over the combination with
England, is not seen to add anything of significance.

1 **Claim 8** recites one or more computer-readable media having computer
2 readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the
3 computer to [emphasis added]:

- 4 • download a file that contains at least one media-specific file
5 configured to provide a user interface, and song files with which
6 the user interface is associated;
- 7 • play the song files with a media player; and
- 8 • automatically display the user interface when the song files are
9 played with the media player.

10 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Dwek
11 anticipates the subject matter of this claim and takes the same position that it did
12 with regard to claim 1. For the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1, this
13 claim is allowable.

14 **Claim 9** recites a media player comprising software code that is configured
15 to [emphasis added]:

- 16 • download a file that contains at least one media-specific file
17 configured to provide a user interface, and media content with
18 which the user interface is associated;
- 19 • play the media content; and
- 20 • automatically display the user interface on at least a portion of a
21 media player user interface when the media content is played with
22 the media player.

23 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Dwek
24 anticipates the subject matter of this claim and takes the same position that it did
25 with regard to claim 1. For the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1, this
claim is allowable.

1 **Claims 10 and 11** depend from claim 9 and are allowable as depending
2 from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own
3 recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 9, are neither
4 disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination
5 with one another. In addition, given the allowability of claim 9, the rejection of
6 claim 11 over the combination with England is not seen to add anything of
7 significance.

8 **Claim 12** has been amended and, as amended, recites a method of
9 organizing media content comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- 10 • providing at least one media-specific file that is configured to
- 11 provide a user interface on at least a portion of a media player;
- 12 • providing at least one media content file configured for play on the
- 13 media player; and
- 14 • associating the one media-specific file with the one media content
- 15 file such that any time the one media content file is played on the
- 16 media player, the one media-specific file is processed to
- 17 automatically display the user interface on at least a portion of the
- 18 media player,
- 19 • ***wherein said associating comprises packaging the one media-***
- 20 ***specific file and the one media content file in a single***
- 21 ***downloadable file.***

22 This claim has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 17.
23 In making out the rejection of claim 17, the Office relies on Bodin and argues that
24 it discloses packaging a media-specific file and one media content file in a single
25 downloadable file. The Office then argues that its combination with Dwek would
render the subject matter of this claim obvious arguing that one would be
motivated to make the combination to “optimize downloaded delivery times for

1 the transfer of files between networked systems.” Applicant disagrees for a couple
2 of different reasons.

3 First, Dwek does not appear to suffer from any optimization problems that
4 Bodin would mitigate. Second, Dwek appears to teach directly away from the
5 combination proffered by the Office by specifically instructing that its individual
6 music selections are packaged as single files. That is, there is no foundation in
7 Dwek for supporting the modification that the Office is attempting. Third and
8 perhaps more importantly, making the modification that the Office proposes
9 would, in fact, complicate Dwek’s performance. Specifically, Bodin instructs, in
10 column 2, starting at around line 25, that in order to download a selected file along
11 with the appropriate similarly related files, “a user has to initiate several separate
12 download sessions. In each of these sessions, the user must specify which
13 objects/files must be obtained and where the files are to be stored on a client
14 machine.” Thus, in Bodin, the onus is on the user to select the files. Modifying
15 Dwek as suggested by the Office would then require the user to, for example,
16 select the advertisements that they wish to see and specify where the associated
17 advertising files are to be stored. Doing so, however, creates some problems. For
18 example, the user would be greatly burdened by this. In addition, Dwek does not
19 contemplate the user selecting advertisements at all. In fact, it does not make
20 sense to have the user select advertisements. Rather, Dwek teaches directly away
21 from such notion by specifically instructing that advertisements come from
22 advertisers. Moreover, giving the user the ability to select advertisements could
23 conceivably lead to a situation in which the user selects no advertisements. This is
24 directly contrary to one of the main purposes of Dwek – which is to remove the
25 user’s ability to interact with advertisements.

1 Accordingly, for any or all of these reasons, the Office has failed to
2 establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

3 **Claims 13-16 and 18** depend from claim 12 and are allowable as
4 depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their
5 own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 12, are
6 neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in
7 combination with one another. In addition, given the allowability of claim 12, the
8 rejection of claim 13 over the combination with England, and claim 14 over the
9 combination with Van Zoest is not seen to add anything of significance.

10 **Claim 19** has been amended and, as amended, recites a method of
11 organizing media content comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- 12 • providing at least one media-specific file that is configured to
- 13 provide a media player user interface;
- 14 • providing at least one media content file configured for play on a
- 15 media player; and
- 16 • associating the one media-specific file with the one media content
- 17 file such that any time the one media content file is played on the
- 18 media player, the one media-specific file is processed to
- 19 automatically display the media player user interface,
- 20 • ***wherein said associating comprises packaging the one media-***
- 21 ***specific file and the one media content file in a single***
- 22 ***downloadable file.***

23 This claim has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 23.
24 In making out the rejection of claim 23, the Office relies on Bodin and argues its
25 combination with Dwek as argued in the rejection of claim 17. For all of the
reasons set forth above with regard to the allowability of claim 12, this claim is
allowable.

1 **Claims 20-22 and 24** depend from claim 19 and are allowable as
2 depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their
3 own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 19, are
4 neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in
5 combination with one another. In addition, given the allowability of claim 19, the
6 rejection of claim 20 over the combination with Van Zoest is not seen to add
7 anything of significance.

8 **Claim 25** recites method of organizing content for a user experience
9 comprising [emphasis added]:

- 10 • *providing multiple different files that define different aspects of a*
11 *media player user interface, at least some files being associated*
12 *with media content and at least some other files being associated*
13 *with visual content;* and
- 14 • organizing the files for sending over a network to a client computer,
15 said organizing using a hierarchical tag-based structure to establish a
16 relationship between the files such that when the media content is
17 played by a media player, the visual content is automatically
18 displayed as at least part of the media player user interface.

19 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Dwek in
20 view of Bodin renders obvious the subject matter of this claim. Specifically, the
21 Office argues that Bodin discloses providing multiple different files that define
22 different aspects of a media player *user interface*. The Office further argues that
23 Bodin discloses the recited act of organizing using a hierarchical tag-based
24 structure, citing to Bodin's column 2, lines 23-26 and lines 31-39.

25 Applicant respectfully submits that this excerpt in Bodin does not make any
26 mention of a hierarchical tag-based structure to accomplish an organizing act as

1 recited in this claim. The Office has apparently taken a fanciful interpretation of
2 this excerpt of Bodin. The Office is not free to ascribe properties to Bodin that it
3 simply does not appear to have.

4 Accordingly, for at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

5 **Claims 26 and 27** depend from claim 25 and are allowable as depending
6 from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own
7 recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 25, are neither
8 disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination
9 with one another. In addition, given the allowability of claim 25, the rejection of
10 claim 27 over the combination with Van Zoest is not seen to add anything of
11 significance.

12 **Claim 28** recites a method of accessing media content comprising
13 [emphasis added]:

- 14
- 15 • displaying a link to media content;
 - 16 • responsive to a user clicking on the link, *automatically downloading*
17 *a file that contains at least one media content file and at least one*
18 *file that is configured to provide at least a portion of a media*
19 *player user interface that is specific to media content associated*
20 *with the one media content file;*
 - 21 • playing the media content on a media player; and
 - 22 • responsive to said playing, automatically displaying said portion of
23 the media player user interface.

24 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Dwek
25 anticipates the subject matter of this claim. Specifically, the Office makes the
26 same argument it did with regard to claim 1 above. For the same reasons as
27 discussed in claim 1 above, Dwek does not anticipate this claim.

1 Accordingly, for at least these reasons, this claim is allowable.

2 **Claims 29 and 30** depend from claim 28 and are allowable as depending
3 from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own
4 recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 28, are neither
5 disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination
6 with one another.

7 **Claim 31** recites one or more computer-readable media having computer
8 readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the
9 computer to [emphasis added]:

- 10
- 11 • display a link to media content;
 - 12 • responsive to a user clicking on the link, *automatically download a*
13 *file that contains at least one media content file and at least one*
14 *file that is configured to provide at least a portion of a media*
15 *player user interface that is specific to media content associated*
16 *with the one media content file;*
 - 17 • play the media content on a media player; and
 - 18 • responsive to playing the media content, automatically display said
19 portion of the media player user interface.
- 20

21 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Dwek
22 anticipates the subject matter of this claim. Specifically, the Office makes the
23 same argument it did with regard to claim 1 above. For the same reasons as
24 discussed in claim 1 above, Dwek does not anticipate this claim.

25 Accordingly, for at least these reasons, this claim is allowable.

1 **Claim 32** recites a media delivery mechanism comprising [emphasis
2 added]:

- 3
- 4 • *a single file comprising:*
 - 5 ○ *one or more media content files* associated with content that can
6 be played on a media player;
 - 7 ○ *one or more content-specific files* that can be processed to
8 provide a *content-specific user interface* associated with content
9 that is played on the media player; and
 - 10 ○ a relationship between the one or more media content files and
11 the one or more content-specific files such that a content-specific
12 user interface is displayed on a computer when the content
13 associated with the one or more media content files is played on
14 the media player.

15 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject
16 matter is obvious in view of Dwek and Bodin. Specifically, the Office again
17 argues that column 15, lines 5-8 and 14-18, and column 11 line 66 through column
18 12 line 4 disclose all of the subject matter of this claim except for a single file.
19 For this feature, the Office relies on Bodin and argues that its combination with
20 Dwek would be motivated to “optimize downloaded delivery times for the transfer
21 of files between networked systems.”

22 Applicant disagrees for a couple of different reasons. First, Dwek does not
23 appear to suffer from any optimization problems that Bodin would mitigate.
24 Second, Dwek appears to teach directly away from the combination proffered by
25 the Office by specifically instructing that its individual music selections are
packaged as single files that contain only music. That is, there is no foundation in
Dwek for supporting the modification that the Office is attempting. Third and
perhaps more importantly, making the modification that the Office proposes

1 would, in fact, complicate Dwek's performance. Specifically, Bodin instructs, in
2 column 2, starting at around line 25, that in order to download a selected file along
3 with the appropriate similarly related files, "a user has to initiate several separate
4 download sessions. In each of these sessions, the user must specify which
5 objects/files must be obtained and where the files are to be stored on a client
6 machine." Thus, in Bodin, the onus is on the user to select the files. Modifying
7 Dwek as suggested by the Office would then require the user to, for example,
8 select the advertisements that they wish to see and specify where the associated
9 advertising files are to be stored. Doing so, however, creates some problems. For
10 example, the user would be greatly burdened by this. In addition, Dwek does not
11 contemplate the user selecting advertisements at all. In fact, it does not make
12 sense to have the user select advertisements. Rather, Dwek teaches directly away
13 from such notion by specifically instructing that advertisements come from
14 advertisers. Moreover, giving the user the ability to select advertisements could
15 conceivably lead to a situation in which the user selects no advertisements. This is
16 directly contrary to one of the main purposes of Dwek – which is to remove the
17 user's ability to interact with advertisements.

18 Accordingly, for any or all of these reasons, the Office has failed to
19 establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

20 **Claims 33-38** depend from claim 32 and are allowable as depending from
21 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
22 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 32, are neither disclosed
23 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
24 another. In addition, given the allowability of claim 32, the rejection of claim 34
25 over the combination with Van Zoest is not seen to add anything of significance.

1 **Claim 39** has been amended and, as amended, recites a method of
2 providing a media delivery mechanism comprising [added language appears in
3 bold italics]:

- 4 • providing one or more media-specific files, the files being
5 configured to provide at least a portion of a media player user
6 interface, said portion being associated with specific media that can
7 be played on a media player;
- 8 • providing one or more media content files associated with media that
9 can be played on a media player embodying the media player user
10 interface, said media content files comprising the specific media
11 with which the media player user interface portion is associated; and
- 12 • defining one or more metafiles that associate the one or more media-
13 specific files with the one or more media content files, the one or
14 more metafiles being configured for processing such that when the
15 media player plays media associated with a media content file, the
16 media player automatically renders the media player user interface
17 portion;
- 18 • *associating the one or more media-specific files, the one or more
19 media content files, and the one or more metafiles in a single
20 downloadable file.*

21 This claim has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 40.
22 In making out the rejection of claim 40, the Office argues that its subject matter is
23 obvious in view of Dwek and Bodin. Applicant has addressed this combination
24 above. For the reasons set forth above with regard to the Office's attempted
25 combination of these two references, the Office has failed to establish a *prima*
facie case of obviousness. Accordingly, this claim is allowable.

26 **Claims 41-44** depend from claim 39 and are allowable as depending from
27 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
28 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 39, are neither disclosed
29 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one

1 another. In addition, given the allowability of claim 39, the rejection of claim 41
2 over the combination with Bodin and England, and claim 43 over the combination
3 with Bodin and Van Zoest, is not seen to add anything of significance.

4 **Claim 45** recites a method of providing media content over a network
5 comprising [emphasis added]:

- 6 • receiving input requesting that a file be sent to a client computer, the
7 file comprising:
 - 8 ○ *one or more media content files* associated with content that can
be played on a media player on the client computer,
 - 9 ○ *one or more media-specific files that can be processed to*
10 *provide a content-specific user interface, and*
 - 11 ○ one or more metafiles that establish a relationship between the
one or more media content files and the one or more media
12 specific files such that a content-specific user interface is
displayed when the content is played on the media player; and
- 13 • sending the requested file to the client computer.

14 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Dwek
15 anticipates the subject matter of this claim and makes the same arguments that it
16 made in connection with claim 1. Specifically, the Office again argues that
17 column 15, lines 5-8 and 14-18, and column 11 line 66 through column 12 line 4
18 disclose a file comprising one or more media-specific files that can be processed
19 to provide a content-specific user interface and one or more media content files.

20 As noted above, the Office is simply wrong on this point. Dwek neither
21 discloses nor suggests anything of the like. Applicant respectfully but strongly
22 disagrees and traverses the Office's rejection for the same reasons as discussed in
23 claim 1 above.

24 Accordingly, for at least these reasons, this claim is allowable.
25

1 **Claims 46-49** depend from claim 45 and are allowable as depending from
2 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
3 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 45, are neither disclosed
4 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
5 another. In addition, given the allowability of claim 45, the rejection of claim 48
6 over the combination with Van Zoest is not seen to add anything of significance.

7 **Claim 50** recites a server computer comprising [emphasis added]:

- 8
- 9 • at least one computer-readable media; and
- 10 • computer-readable instructions resident on the computer-readable
11 media which, when executed by the server, cause the server to:
 - 12 ○ maintain multiple files, *each file comprising*:
 - 13 ▪ *one or more media content files* associated with content that
14 can be played on a media player on the client computer,
 - 15 ▪ *one or more media-specific files that can be processed to*
16 *provide a content-specific user interface*, and
 - 17 ▪ one or more metafiles that establish a relationship between
18 the one or more media content files and the one or more
19 media specific files such that a content-specific user interface
20 is displayed when the content is played on the media player;
 - 21 ○ receive input requesting that one or more of the multiple files be
22 sent to a client computer; and
 - 23 ○ send the one or more requested files to the client computer.
- 24
- 25

19 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Dwek in
20 view of Bodin renders obvious the subject matter of this claim. For all of the
21 reasons set forth above with regard to the Office's failure to establish a *prima facie*
22 case of obviousness with regard to the combination of Dwek and Bodin, this claim
23 is allowable.
24
25

1 **Claim 51** recites a method for playing media content on a media player
2 comprising [emphasis added]:

- 3
- 4 • receiving a file with a client computer, *the file comprising*:
 - 5 ○ *one or more media content files* associated with content that can
6 be rendered on a media player on the client computer,
 - 7 ○ *at least one media-specific file that can be processed to provide*
8 *a content-specific user interface*, and
 - 9 ○ at least one metafile that establishes a relationship between the
10 media content files and the media-specific files such that a
11 content-specific user interface is provided when the content
12 associated with the content files is played on the media player;
 - 13 • playing content associated with the content files on the media player
14 embodied on the client computer; and
 - 15 • while playing the content on the media player, displaying the
16 content-specific user interface.

17

18 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Dwek
19 anticipates the subject matter of this claim. Applicant respectfully submits, for the
20 reasons set forth above, that Dwek neither discloses nor suggests receiving a file
21 comprising one or more media content files and at least one media-specific file
22 that can be processed to provide a content-specific user interface. This being the
23 case, it is virtually impossible for Dwek to disclose or suggest a file that further
24 includes at least one metafile as recited in this claim.

25 Accordingly, for at least these reasons, this claim is allowable.

Claims 52-54 depend from claim 51 and are allowable as depending from
an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
features which, in combination with those recited in claim 51, are neither disclosed
nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
another.

1 **Claim 55** recites a media player comprising software code that is
2 configured to [emphasis added]:

- 3 • receive a file with a client computer, *the file comprising*:
 - 4 ○ one or more media content files associated with content that can
5 be rendered on the media player,
 - 6 ○ *at least one media-specific file that can be processed to provide
a content-specific user interface*, and
 - 7 ○ at least one metafile that establishes a relationship between the
8 media content files and the media-specific files such that a
9 content-specific user interface is provided when the content
10 associated with the content files is played on the media player;
- 11 • play content associated with the content files; and
- 12 • while playing the content, display the content-specific user interface.

13 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Dwek
14 anticipates the subject matter of this claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees and
15 traverses the Office's rejection for the reasons mentioned above with regard to
16 claim 51.

17 **Claim 56** recites method for processing media content comprising
18 [emphasis added]:

- 19 • receiving a file with a client computer, *the file comprising*:
 - 20 ○ one or more media content files associated with content that can
21 be rendered on a media player on the client computer,
 - 22 ○ *at least one media-specific file that can be processed to provide
a content-specific user interface*, and
 - 23 ○ at least one metafile that establishes a relationship between the
24 media content files and the media-specific files such that a
25 content-specific user interface is provided when the content
associated with the content files is played on the media player;
and
 - automatically organizing the received files in one or more
directories on a client computer hard drive without any
intervention from a user, the files being organized in a manner

1 that permits audio and visual content to be played on a media
2 player without any intervention from the user.

3 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Dwek
4 anticipates the subject matter of this claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees and
5 traverses the Office's rejection for the reasons mentioned above with regard to
6 claim 51.

7 Accordingly, for at least these reasons, this claim is allowable.

8 **Claims 57-60** depend from claim 56 and are allowable as depending from
9 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
10 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 56, are neither disclosed
11 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
12 another.

13 **Claim 61** recites a media player comprising software code configured to
14 cause the media player to [emphasis added]:

- 15
- 16 • receive a file, *the file comprising*:
 - 17 ○ one or more media content files associated with content that can
18 be rendered on the media player,
 - 19 ○ *at least one media-specific file that can be processed to provide*
20 *a content-specific user interface*, and
 - 21 ○ at least one metafile that establishes a relationship between the
22 media content files and the media-specific files such that a
23 content-specific user interface is provided when the content
24 associated with the content files is played on the media player;
25 and
 - automatically organize the received files in one or more directories
on a client computer hard drive without any intervention from a user,
the files being organized in a manner that permits audio and visual
content to be played on the media player without any intervention
from the user.

1 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Dwek
2 anticipates the subject matter of this claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees and
3 traverses the Office's rejection for the reasons mentioned above with regard to
4 claim 51.

5 Accordingly, for at least these reasons, this claim is allowable.

6 **Claim 62** depends from claim 61 and is allowable as depending from an
7 allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features
8 which, in combination with those recited in claim 61, are neither disclosed nor
9 suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
10 another.

11 **Claim 63** recites a method of playing media content comprising [emphasis
12 added]:

- 13
- 14 • receiving a file with a client computer, *the file comprising*:
 - 15 ○ one or more media content files associated with content that can
16 be played on a media player on the client computer,
 - 17 ○ *at least one media-specific file that can be processed to provide*
18 *a content-specific user interface*, and
 - 19 ○ at least one metafile that establishes a relationship between the
20 media content files and the media-specific files such that a
21 content-specific user interface is provided when the content
22 associated with the content files is played on the media player;
23 and
 - 24 • automatically playing content associated with the one or more media
25 content files using a media player embodied on the client computer;
and
 - while playing said content, automatically displaying the content-
specific user interface.

23 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Dwek
24 anticipates the subject matter of this claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees and
25

1 traverses the Office's rejection for the reasons mentioned above with regard to
2 claim 51.

3 Accordingly, for at least these reasons, this claim is allowable.

4 **Claims 64-65** depend from claim 63 and are allowable as depending from
5 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
6 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 63, are neither disclosed
7 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
8 another.

9
10 **Conclusion**

11 All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant
12 requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. **If the Office maintains its**
13 **rejections over the art, Applicant intends to appeal this case.**

14
15 Respectfully Submitted,

16
17 Dated: 1/13/06

18 By: 

19 Lance R. Sadler
20 Reg. No. 38,605
21 (509) 324-9256
22
23
24
25